

Remarks/Arguments:

Based on the filing of the concurrent RCE, reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 14-21 and 23-33 are now in the application. Claim 22 was previously cancelled. Claims 14-16 have been amended. Claims 32 and 33 have been added. Support for claim 32 can be found in claims 14 and 23. Support for claim 33 can be found in claim 14 and on page 15, lines 5-14 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 14 and 22-31 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) (hereinafter "Yamada") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in Fig. 7 and in claims 15 and 16 of the specification.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 15 and 16. Claims 15 and 16 were not rejected over Yamada. Therefore, claim 14 is allowable over Yamada. Since claim 14 is allowable over Yamada, dependent claims 22-31 are allowable over Yamada as well.

In the fourth paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 14, 16-19, and 21 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Hoshino et al. (EP 1081944 A2) (hereinafter "Hoshino") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As noted above, claim 14 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 15 and 16. Claim 15 was not rejected over Hoshino. Therefore, claim 14 is allowable over Hoshino. Since claim 14 is allowable over Yamada, dependent claims 17-19, and 21 are allowable over Hoshino as well.

In the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim 15 has been rejected as being obvious over Yamada (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) in view of Nakajoh (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025825 A1) (hereinafter "Nakajoh") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Nakajoh does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamada. Since claim 14 is allowable, dependent claim 15 is allowable as well.

Since claim 14 was amended as indicated above, claim 14 will be discussed with respect to the rejection over Yamada in view of Nakajoh.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 14 calls for, *inter alia*:

the lens holder being supported in the thin region of the circuit carrier, and the semiconductor device being disposed on an opposite side of the circuit carrier with respect to the lens holder and in the thin region of the circuit carrier.

None of the references shows or suggests a thin region of a circuit carrier supported by a thick region, where the semiconductor device (flip chip) is disposed in the thin region on one side of the circuit carrier and the lens holder is supported in the thin region on the opposite the semiconductor device (on the other side) of the circuit carrier.

Nakajoh discloses a bond wiring semiconductor device and not a flip-chip semiconductor device for his configuration (Fig. 2

and paragraph [0077]. Therefore, the thickness of the circuit carrier does not play a role with respect to the tolerance of the configuration of Nakajoh. This is because the lens holder and the semiconductor device are disposed on the same side of the circuit carrier.

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The references do not show or suggest the lens holder being supported in the thin region of the circuit carrier, and the semiconductor device being disposed on an opposite side of the circuit carrier with respect to the lens holder and in the thin region of the circuit carrier, as recited in claim 14 of the instant application.

The Examiner correctly stated on page 4 of the Office action that Yamada does not disclose that the lens holder is disposed in the thin region of the circuit carrier.

As seen from the above-given remarks, Nakajoh discloses that the the lens holder and the semiconductor device are disposed on the same side of the circuit carrier. Therefore, Nakajoh does not disclose the semiconductor device and the lens holder

are disposed on opposite sides of the circuit carrier in the thin region of the circuit carrier. Accordingly, Nakajoh does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamada.

The references applied by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, there is not a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The following further remarks pertain to new claim 32 of the instant application.

Claim 32 calls for, *inter alia*:

the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region being a flexible printed circuit board and the thick region being a rigid printed circuit board.

Yamada does not disclose that the connection section (21) is a portion of a multilayer printed circuit board.

The Yamada reference does not show the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region being a flexible printed circuit board and the thick region being a

rigid printed circuit board, as recited in claim 32 of the instant application.

The Hoshino reference discloses that the element (13) is a metal plate. Therefore, Hoshino does not disclose that the substrate (10) is a multilayered PCB.

The Hoshino reference does not show the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region being a flexible printed circuit board and the thick region being a rigid printed circuit board, as recited in claim 32 of the instant application.

The following further remarks pertain to new claim 33 of the instant application.

Claim 33 calls for, *inter alia*:

the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thick region defines a frame at least partially surrounding the thin region, the frame clamping the thin region.

None of references show the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thick region defines a frame at least partially surrounding the thin region, the frame clamping the thin region, as recited in claim 33 of the instant application.

In the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim 20 has been rejected as being obvious over Yamada (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) in view of Kothmeier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0193609 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Kothmeier does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamada. Since claim 14 is allowable, dependent claim 20 is allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 14, 32, or 33. Claims 14, 32 and 33 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 14 or 33, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-21 and 23-33 are solicited.

The following further remarks pertain to the Interview Summary dated July 22, 2008, which pertains to the telephonic Interview conducted on July 15, 2008.

The summary correctly listed the participants. No exhibit was presented. Claim 14 was discussed. No prior art was discussed. There was no agreement. The Examiner's substance of interview appears to be accurate.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

2003PI2502 - Application No. 10/573,539
Response to Office action July 22, 2008
Response submitted August 15, 2008

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:sa

August 15, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101